

R-Parity Violation at HERA

J. Butterworth and H. Dreiner

Department of Physics, University of Oxford,
1 Keble Rd, Oxford OX1 3RH

Abstract

We summarize the signals at HERA in supersymmetric models with explicitly broken R-parity. As the most promising case, we consider in detail the resonant production of single squarks through an operator $L_1 Q_i \bar{D}_j$, a production process analogous to that for leptoquarks. However, the dominant decay of the squark to a quark and a photino leads to a very different experimental signature. We examine in particular the case where the photino decays to a positron and two quarks. Using a detailed Monte-Carlo procedure we obtain a discovery limit in the squark mass—Yukawa coupling plane. HERA can discover a squark for a mass as large as 270 GeV and for an R-parity violating Yukawa coupling as small as 5.8×10^{-3} .

1 Introduction

Supersymmetry [1] (SUSY) is a promising solution to the gauge-hierarchy problem [2]. It has been thoroughly analysed in the minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM), which has the minimal field content *and* the minimal superpotential consistent with the Standard Model (SM). The MSSM has a discrete, multiplicative symmetry known as R-parity

$$R_p = (-)^{2S+3B+L}, \quad (1)$$

where S , B , and L are the spin, the baryon and the lepton quantum numbers, respectively. The fields of the SM, including the extra scalar Higgs doublet, have $R_p = +1$; their superpartners have $R_p = -1$. Recently there has been much theoretical [3], cosmological [4, 5, 6, 7] and phenomenological work [8, 9, 10, 11] on the more general supersymmetric extension of the SM with explicitly broken R-parity ($\mathcal{R}_p$). As in the MSSM, this only requires the minimal field content consistent with the SM, but in contrast allows for *all* gauge and supersymmetric invariant terms in the superpotential including now $\mathcal{R}_p$ terms which violate either lepton- or baryon-number. $\mathcal{R}_p$ has been shown to be theoretically consistent with grand unification theories [12, 13], as well as with superstring theory [14], and it is possibly better theoretically motivated than the MSSM [3]. There has also been an extensive discussion on cosmological bounds on *all* $\mathcal{R}_p$ -operators [4, 6, 7]. In Ref.[7] it was shown that most bounds no longer apply, given

reasonable assumptions on the mechanism for mattergenesis. We therefore find it very much worthwhile to experimentally search for $\mathcal{R}_p$.

To date the most stringent experimental bounds on the $\mathcal{R}_p$ Yukawa couplings have been determined from virtual effects of the new supersymmetric states in processes involving only SM final states. $\mathcal{R}_p$ could be found, or these bounds substantially improved, by direct searches for supersymmetric particles at colliders.

The single squark production mechanism is analogous to that of leptoquarks. Thus it is important to discriminate $\mathcal{R}_p$ squark from leptoquark production. We study in detail the distinguishing dominant cascade decay of the squarks to a quark and a photino and show that searching for this decay leads to the greatest discovery potential in the squark mass–Yukawa coupling plane.

In the following section we will give a brief theoretical overview of $\mathcal{R}_p$ models. Then, in section 3 we will proceed to discuss the prospects for discovering supersymmetry at HERA, both for the MSSM and for $\mathcal{R}_p$ models. We show that, while HERA is conventionally considered to be relatively uncompetitive with present limits for supersymmetric searches in the MSSM [15, 16, 17], it is well suited to study a subclass of $\mathcal{R}_p$ -models, which allow for resonant single squark production. Identifying the most promising case, in section 4 we then present cross-section and branching fraction calculations. Using these as input to a detailed Monte-Carlo of these processes, and coupling this with a simulation of the ZEUS detector, we examine possible backgrounds to these processes and evaluate the discovery potential in ZEUS. We show that $\mathcal{R}_p$ leads to a much larger mass reach than in MSSM searches and gives HERA the possibility of finding supersymmetry.

2 Theoretical Overview

Given the particle content of the SM, the most general gauge and supersymmetry invariant superpotential is given by [18]

$$W = W_{MSSM} + W_{\mathcal{R}_p}, \quad (2)$$

where the first term includes those couplings which give mass to the matter fields and which are included in the MSSM. The second term in Eq.(2) consists of the $\mathcal{R}_p$ Yukawa couplings¹

$$W_{\mathcal{R}_p} = \lambda_{ijk}[L_i L_j \bar{E}_k]_F + \lambda'_{ijk}[L_i Q_j \bar{D}_k]_F + \lambda''_{ijk}[\bar{U}_i \bar{D}_j \bar{D}_k]_F. \quad (3)$$

Here we have used the superfield notation; L and $\bar{E}$ (Q and $\bar{U}$, $\bar{D}$) are the (left-handed) lepton doublet and the antilepton singlet (quark doublet and antiquark singlet) chiral superfields respectively. λ , λ' and λ'' are dimensionless coupling constants and i, j, k are generation indices. $SU(2)$ and $SU(3)$ indices have been suppressed here and throughout. The subscript F denotes the supersymmetric invariant part in the product of chiral superfields.

As well as breaking R-Parity, the first two sets of terms in Eq.(3) violate lepton number conservation, and the last set violates baryon number conservation. Together

¹For a review of supersymmetry and in particular the notation employed here see Ref.[1].

they can lead to an unacceptable level of proton decay, a problem which is avoided if R_p conservation is imposed ($W_{R_p} \equiv 0$). However, it is sufficient to impose a discrete symmetry which allows for either only the lepton-number violating terms ($LL\bar{E}$, $LQ\bar{D}$) or for only the baryon number violating terms ($\bar{U}\bar{D}\bar{D}$) in the Lagrangian.² These discrete symmetries are theoretically on an equal footing with each other and with R_p [7] with the one allowing for the lepton-number violating R_p -operators possibly preferred [3].

At HERA we are particularly interested in the case where an operator $[L_1 Q_i \bar{D}_j]_F$ is dominant, since this leads to resonant squark production. We therefore present the Yukawa couplings explicitly in terms of the 4-component Dirac states

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{L_1 Q_i \bar{D}_j} = & \lambda'_{1ij} \left[-\tilde{e}_L u_L^i \bar{d}_R^j - e_L \tilde{u}_L^i \bar{d}_R^j - (\bar{e}_L)^c u_L^i \tilde{d}_R^j \right. \\ & \left. + \tilde{\nu}_L d_L^i \bar{d}_R^j + \nu_L \tilde{d}_L^i \bar{d}_R^j + (\bar{\nu}_L)^c d_L^i \tilde{d}_R^j \right] + h.c. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Here the tilde denotes the scalar superpartners and the superscript c denotes the charge conjugated spinor. The minus signs are due to the $SU(2)$ structure of the term.

3 Supersymmetry at HERA

In discussing the possible R_p signals at HERA we shall closely follow the discussion and notation of Ref.[19]. In particular we shall also make the following simplifying assumptions

- We consider only those cases where in turn one of the 45 operators in Eq.(3) dominates and the others are negligible, *i.e.* there is a hierarchy in the R_p Yukawa couplings. This is a reasonable assumption since the known Yukawa couplings to the Higgs in the SM show such a hierarchy ($m_{elec}/m_{top} \simeq 3 \cdot 10^{-6}$).
- The lightest supersymmetric particle (LSP) is a neutralino, which we denote by $\tilde{\Lambda}$. This is a non-trivial assumption, since the cosmological bounds, which restrict the LSP to be a neutralino in the MSSM [20] no longer apply in the case of R_p ³. However, renormalization group analyses in minimal supergravity models, which shouldn't be much affected by a small R_p Yukawa coupling, suggest that the LSP is indeed a neutralino [21]. When studying specific signals in detail we will for simplification assume the LSP to be the photino.

The phenomenology of R_p differs from that of the MSSM in two main aspects: (1) the LSP is no longer stable since it is not protected by a symmetry; it can therefore decay within the detector; and (2) it is possible to have single production of supersymmetric particles, since the final state is no longer restricted to be R_p -even. We shall make use of both of these points when discussing the dominant R_p -signal at HERA in section 3.3.

(1) The LSP can decay *via* the process shown in Figure 1, where we have circled the R_p vertex. It will decay either within or outside of the detector. The condition that

²As discussed in Ref.[7] it is sufficient to exclude the simultaneous presence of the $[LQ\bar{D}]_F$ terms and the $[\bar{U}\bar{D}\bar{D}]_F$ terms.

³See Ref.[6] for a brief discussion of relic LSP densities in the case of R_p

the LSP decays within the detector translates into a lower bound on the $\mathcal{R}_p$ -Yukawa coupling [22, 19]

$$\lambda_{\mathcal{R}_p} > 1.6\gamma \cdot 10^{-4} (m_{\tilde{f}}/100 \text{ GeV})^2 (10 \text{ GeV}/M_{\tilde{\Lambda}})^{5/2}, \quad (5)$$

where γ is the Lorentz boost factor in the lab-frame. $m_{\tilde{f}}$ is the mass of the scalar fermion which enters via the propagator in the LSP decay (*cf.* Figure 1). Here we have made the approximations of massless final state particles and $m_{\tilde{f}} \gg M_{\tilde{\Lambda}}$, and demanded that $c\gamma\tau_{LSP} \lesssim 1m$, where τ_{LSP} is the mean lifetime of the LSP. The constraint (5) is always satisfied for the ranges of the squark mass and the $\mathcal{R}_p$ -Yukawa coupling which HERA can probe through single squark production, provided $M_{\tilde{\Lambda}} \gtrsim 10 \text{ GeV}$.

(2) In $\mathcal{R}_p$ models there are two dominant production mechanisms for supersymmetric particles. First, there is the conventional pair or associated production through MSSM (super-) gauge couplings. In addition, there is also the possibility of single scalar fermion production directly through $\mathcal{R}_p$ -couplings, which is *not* possible in the MSSM. In both cases the supersymmetric states can decay within the detector to lower mass, R_p -even states giving the two sets of signals

$$(\text{SUSY Pair production}) \quad \text{with} \quad (\mathcal{R}_p - \text{decay}), \quad (6)$$

$$(\mathcal{R}_p, \text{ single SUSY production}) \quad \text{with} \quad (\mathcal{R}_p - \text{decay}), \quad (7)$$

which we have summarized in Table 1. The table is analogous to the table presented in Ref.[19]; for completeness we discuss it in detail in the appendix. Throughout we assume that the inequality (5) is satisfied and thus assume all final states to be R_p even. If the LSP does *not* decay within the detector, the signal (6) reduces to the standard scenario in the MSSM with missing p_T ($\cancel{p}_T$) signals which have been widely discussed. For a long-lived LSP the process (7) could still lead to novel signals. However, the cross section for single SUSY production is proportional to $(\lambda')^2$ and thus strongly suppressed in the case where the Yukawa coupling λ' violates the inequality (5). In section 3.2 we discuss the case (6) and in the remainder of the paper we discuss the more promising case (7) in detail. However, before moving on we review the possibilities for observing supersymmetry in the case of the MSSM (section 3.1).

3.1 MSSM at HERA

In the case of conserved R_p , the LSP is stable. At HERA, the two dominant production mechanisms of the MSSM are [15, 16, 17]

$$e^- + q \rightarrow \tilde{\nu}_e + \tilde{q}, \quad (8)$$

$$e^- + q \rightarrow \tilde{e}^- + \tilde{q}. \quad (9)$$

In the reaction (9), the decay products are neutral in most scenarios and therefore hard to detect. We focus on the neutral current process (9); for an integrated luminosity of 200 pb^{-1} , the discovery potential is [16]⁴

$$m_{\tilde{e}} + m_{\tilde{q}} \lesssim 200 \text{ GeV}. \quad (10)$$

⁴A more optimistic discovery reach was obtained in Ref.[23], however not within the MSSM since the neutralino masses were varied independently of each other.

In obtaining this limit the authors assumed that there are no decays of the squark or selectron other than that to the LSP.

The discovery reach is to be compared with the existing experimental scalar fermion mass bounds. From LEP we have the model independent bounds [24]

$$m_{\tilde{e}}, m_{\tilde{q}} \gtrsim 45 \text{ GeV}, \quad (11)$$

which are determined from the Z^0 width. CDF quote a much stronger, but model dependent bound for the squark mass [25]

$$m_{\tilde{q}} \gtrsim 150 \text{ GeV}, \quad (12)$$

for which it was also assumed that there are no cascade decays of the squarks and that all six squarks are degenerate in mass. In contrast, if one assumes a spectrum of non-degenerate squark masses, with one squark substantially lighter than the others, the bound on the lightest squark is much weaker [26], $m_{\tilde{q}} \gtrsim 64 \text{ GeV}$. Comparing the experimental bounds with the discovery reach at HERA (10) we can conclude that for 6 degenerate squarks there is only a very small window of discovery for the MSSM. If the top squark is much lighter than the other squarks [27], then there is still the possibility of discovering R_p conserving supersymmetry at HERA [28].

3.2 Pair Production with R_p Decay

In R_p models, the LSP decays and the standard p_T signal is either diluted or completely absent, depending on the dominant R_p -operator. The decays of the supersymmetric particles in the various R_p -models have been discussed in detail in Ref.[19]. We have made use of these results in compiling the dominant signals of the processes (6) in the first three rows of Table 1.

For a dominant operator $[L_i L_j \bar{E}_k]_F$, for example, the LSP decays to two charged leptons and a neutrino,

$$\tilde{\Lambda} \rightarrow e_i^\pm + e_k^\mp + \nu_j, \quad [L_i L_j \bar{E}_k]_F, \quad (13)$$

which in the case of the charged current production (8) results in a signal of 5 charged leptons! (the entry in the first row and the second column). In the case of a dominant operator $[L_i Q_j \bar{D}_k]_F$ we have

$$\tilde{\Lambda} \rightarrow (e_i^\pm, \nu_i, \bar{\nu}_i) + 2 \text{ jets}, \quad [L_i Q_j \bar{D}_k]_F, \quad (14)$$

and the optimal signal still contains 3 charged leptons.

From Table 1 we conclude, that in the case of pair production and R_p -decays, the dominant operator $[\bar{U} \bar{D} \bar{D}]_F$ does not lead to any promising signals. The two most promising signals for discovery of SUSY are the charged current production (8) followed by the LSP decays (13) or (14).

In order to get a rough estimate of the discovery potential at HERA for these two models we make use of the total production cross section $\sigma(e^- P \rightarrow \tilde{e}^- \tilde{q} + X)$ taken from reference [16]. For the dominant operator $[L_i L_j \bar{E}_k]_F$ we restrict ourselves to first

and second generation charged leptons: $i, j, k = 1, 2$; there is no SM background for the production of five charged leptons in the final state. As an optimistic estimate, we demand a discovery limit of five events, before any acceptance cuts, for an integrated luminosity of 200 pb^{-1} to be sufficient for detection. Taking the most optimistic scenario for the neutralino sector of Figure 2, Ref [16], we thus obtain a maximal reach of

$$m_{\tilde{e}} + m_{\tilde{q}} \leq 216 \text{ GeV}, \quad [L_i L_j \bar{E}_k], \quad i, j, k = 1, 2. \quad (15)$$

Next we consider the case (14). For three charged leptons (e or μ), the production rate is suppressed by a branching fraction squared $(0.88)^2$ (*cf.* Section 4.2). If we furthermore require like-sign tri-leptons the production rate is instead reduced by a factor of $(0.44)^2$. Taking this latter case, which eliminates all SM background, and again optimistically only requiring five observed events for an integrated luminosity of 200 pb^{-1} we obtain as a rough estimate of the discovery limit⁵

$$m_{\tilde{e}} + m_{\tilde{q}} \leq 165 \text{ GeV}, \quad L_i Q_j \bar{D}_k, \quad i \neq 3. \quad (16)$$

We now compare these discovery limits with the experimental mass bounds. The model independent LEP bounds (11) still hold in the case of $\mathcal{R}_p$. The CDF bounds on the squark masses are not valid since they relied on $\cancel{p}_T$ signals. However, using the CDF di-lepton search data an independent stringent bound on the squark masses has been determined, which incorporates $\mathcal{R}_p$ decays of the supersymmetric particles [10]

$$m_{\tilde{q}} \geq 175 \text{ GeV}, \quad [L_i L_j \bar{E}_k], \quad i, j, k = 1, 2, \quad (17)$$

$$m_{\tilde{q}} \geq 100 \text{ GeV}, \quad [L_i Q_j \bar{D}_k], \quad i, j \neq 3. \quad (18)$$

In deriving these bounds it was assumed that the LSP is the photino and that there are *five* mass degenerate squarks, thereby allowing for the possibility of a light top squark. Furthermore it was assumed that the branching fraction $BF(\tilde{q} \rightarrow q + \tilde{\gamma}) = 100\%$. Using the CDF di-lepton data the mass bound for a single light squark is as low as the LEP bound [9], again assuming $BF(\tilde{q} \rightarrow q + \tilde{\gamma}) = 100\%$. For $BF(\tilde{q} \rightarrow e^\pm + q') = 50\%$ and $BF(\tilde{q} \rightarrow q + \tilde{\gamma}) = 0$, which is unlikely, $m_{\tilde{q}} \geq 108 \text{ GeV}$ [9], so that a realistic bound for a light squark is presumably somewhat stronger than 45 GeV .

From our rough estimates we conclude that for five degenerate squarks there is no discovery window at HERA for a dominant operator $L_i L_j \bar{E}_k$. In the case of an operator $L_i Q_j \bar{D}_k$ there is still a small discovery window of about 20 GeV , which warrants a proper analysis for $i = 2, 3$ and/or $j = 3$. For $i = 1$, the $\mathcal{R}_p$ single squark production at HERA leads to a significantly larger discovery potential than the pair production. In sections (4) and (5) we discuss this in detail.

⁵We note that for 3 charged leptons in the final state there is the physical background from Z^0 production, $e^- + p \rightarrow e^- + Z^0 + X$, followed by the decay $Z^0 \rightarrow (ee, \mu\mu)$. The total cross section multiplied by the relevant branching fraction to two charged leptons (e, μ) is $\sigma \simeq 2.0 \cdot 10^{-2} \text{ pb}$, Ref.[29]. About 50% of the scattered electrons vanish down the beam pipe and thus the background is roughly a factor five smaller than the signal we are interested in (with no explicit lepton-number violation), and should be included in a proper background study.

3.3 $\mathcal{R}_p$ -Production with $\mathcal{R}_p$ -Decay

At HERA, $\mathcal{R}_p$ includes the unique possibility of single squark production through the couplings given in Eq.(4), and the diagram shown in Figure 2a. We have summarized the possible signals for single squark production in the last 2 rows of Table 1. Single squark production has previously been discussed in Refs.[28, 30]. In both references only the $\mathcal{R}_p$ -decays of the squarks, as in Figure 2b are studied and in Ref.[28] the discussion is limited to the production of top squarks. We extend these analyses to include the dominant cascade decays of the squarks, $\tilde{q} \rightarrow q + \tilde{\gamma}$, followed by the $\mathcal{R}_p$ -decay of the photino, as in Eq.(14) and shown in Figure 2c. Throughout this discussion we make the simplifying assumption that the LSP is the photino, *i.e* it has no Zino or Higgsino admixture.

3.3.1 Analogies to Leptoquark Production

The single production of squarks at HERA is analogous to the production of leptoquarks. In the notation of Ref.[31] the $\tilde{u}_i$ squark corresponds to the $\tilde{R}_2$ leptoquark, and the $\tilde{d}_j$ squark corresponds to the S_1 leptoquark.⁶ The squarks can decay back to the initial state (e^-q) through the Yukawa coupling (4) just as the leptoquarks do, and as shown in Figure 2b. This is observable as a resonant peak in the neutral current deep inelastic differential cross section $d^2\sigma(e^-p \rightarrow e^-X)/dx dQ^2$,⁷ and we can translate most results on the S_1 and $\tilde{R}_2$ leptoquarks into results on $\mathcal{R}_p$. In particular from Ref.[31], Eq.(8) one expects to be able to observe a down-like squark for $m_{\tilde{d}} \simeq 200 \text{ GeV}$ and a Yukawa coupling as small as $\lambda' \simeq 0.01$. This reach is significantly larger than that of Eq.(16), where the pair production was followed by $LQ\bar{D}$ mediated decays.

It is important to discriminate between the discovery of a leptoquark and of supersymmetry with $\mathcal{R}_p$. There are several suggestions as to how this might be done.

(1) As can be seen from the couplings in Eq.(4), it is only the left-handed electrons which couple to the squarks, whereas some leptoquarks can couple to both left- and right-handed electrons. Thus using polarized beams it could be possible to distinguish these two possibilities [30]. However, if the right-handed coupling of the relevant leptoquark vanishes, as it very well may, then this method does not lead to a distinguishing signal.

(2) In Ref.[28] it was suggested that one could distinguish up-like squarks from leptoquarks through their different decay modes which are mediated by the Yukawa couplings. Through the couplings (4) the $\tilde{u}_i$ can only decay as $\tilde{u}_i \rightarrow e^- + \bar{d}_{jR}$, whereas the S_1 leptoquark has two decay modes $S_1 \rightarrow e^- + u$, $\nu + d$ and thus also contributes to the *charged* current deep inelastic scattering. However as we pointed out above, there are leptoquarks other than S_1 . For example, $\tilde{R}_2$ has identical Yukawa-couplings to the up-like squark and also decays as $\tilde{R}_2 \rightarrow e^- + \bar{d}_{jR}$. Therefore this procedure can not be used to distinguish a squark from a leptoquark.

⁶The quantum number F of Table 1 in Ref.[31] does not apply to the corresponding squarks since it was computed assuming the baryon- and lepton-number are conserved at the production vertex.

⁷For the $\tilde{d}_j$ case this is also observable in the charged current cross section.

(3) In supersymmetric theories the squarks have specific gauge couplings through which they can cascade decay to the LSP, $\tilde{q} \rightarrow q + \tilde{\gamma}$. We study these decays as a characteristic feature of squarks and thus study the processes⁸

$$e^- + u_i \rightarrow (\tilde{d}_{jR})^* \rightarrow d_{jR} + \tilde{\gamma}, \quad (19)$$

$$e^- + \bar{d}_j \rightarrow (\tilde{u}_{iL})^* \rightarrow \bar{u}_i + \tilde{\gamma}, \quad (20)$$

which are shown in Figure 2c. The asterisk indicates that the produced squark can be virtual. The photino decays as in Eq.(14), and we focus on the decay $\tilde{\gamma} \rightarrow e^+ + 2 \text{ jets}$. This leads to a single *positron* in the final state, three jets, and no electron or significant $\cancel{p}_T$. This strongly reduces the background compared to the other photino decays but also introduces a branching fraction of about 0.44 (*cf.* Section 4.2). The case of the decay $\tilde{\gamma} \rightarrow \nu_e + 2 \text{ jets}$ leads to a weak $\cancel{p}_T$ signal with large background, which we do not consider promising and have thus also not included in Table 1.

In the following we assume that the only relevant decays of the produced squarks are given by

$$\tilde{d}_{jR} \rightarrow \begin{cases} e_L^- + u_{iL} \\ \nu_e + d_{jR} \\ d_{jR} + \tilde{\gamma} \end{cases}, \quad (21)$$

$$\tilde{u}_{iL} \rightarrow \begin{cases} e_L^- + \bar{d}_{jR} \\ \bar{u}_{iL} + \tilde{\gamma} \end{cases}, \quad (22)$$

which we discuss in more detail in section 4.1. Thus we assume that there are no further cascade decays for example to other neutralinos or to the gluino.

(4) A direct consequence of Eqs.(21,22) is that the total decay width of the squarks should differ from the corresponding decay widths of the leptoquarks. In neutral current deep-inelastic scattering one can in principle measure the mass, coupling and decay width of a “leptoquark” resonance. For a true leptoquark the decay width is given in terms of the mass and one coupling. If the observed resonance is a squark one should find the measured width to be larger than the calculated leptoquark width by up to an order of magnitude. However, it is unlikely that the experimental resolution will be sufficient to accomplish this [32].

3.3.2 Existing Limits

Before moving on to discuss the processes (19,20) in detail we first consider existing experimental bounds on the Yukawa couplings λ'_{ij} , which lead to resonant squark production at HERA. In our study we limit ourselves to the couplings

$$\lambda'_{1ij}, \quad i = 1, 2; \quad j = 1, 2, 3. \quad (23)$$

We do not consider the case where $i = 3$, as this implies a top quark in the initial and/or final state. The case of $i = 3$ has been discussed in Ref.[28], where the authors suggest

⁸To our knowledge this was first proposed in Ref.[30].

that the squarks could be discovered *via* the leptoquark-analogous $\mathcal{R}_p$ -decay. However, in that case it is not clear how the squark could be distinguished from a leptoquark.

The squarks and sleptons can contribute virtually to various processes with R_p -even final states through the relevant $\mathcal{R}_p$ -operators. The experimental values or bounds of these processes directly lead to limits on any contribution beyond that of the SM. In our case this leads to bounds on the $\mathcal{R}_p$ -Yukawa couplings as a function of the squark masses.

The operators $L_1 Q_1 \bar{D}_j$, $j = 1, 2, 3$, contribute to the semileptonic decays of quarks [33]. The $(V - A) \otimes (V - A)$ structure of the $\mathcal{R}_p$, effective four-fermion charged current interaction is identical to that of the SM. Therefore its contribution is equivalent to a shift in the Fermi-constant. If, as we have assumed, *one* $\mathcal{R}_p$ -operator is dominant, then this is a violation of charged current universality [33]. The experimental limits lead to a bound on the corresponding Yukawa coupling at the *two* sigma level

$$\lambda'_{11j} \lesssim 0.03 \left(\frac{m_{\tilde{d}_{jR}}}{100 \text{ GeV}} \right), \quad j = 1, 2, 3, \quad (24)$$

and we note that the bound is only correlated to the $SU(2)$ singlet, down-like squark mass, not the doublet, up-like squark mass. If we allow for more than one $\mathcal{R}_p$ operator to contribute, then the violation of universality is reduced and the above bound is correspondingly weakened.

The operators $L_1 Q_2 \bar{D}_j$, $j = 1, 2, 3$, contribute to forward-backward asymmetries measured in e^+e^- -collisions. Requiring the combination of $\mathcal{R}_p$ and SM contribution to agree with the experimental data at the one sigma level one obtains bounds on the Yukawa coupling constants [33]

$$\lambda'_{12j} \lesssim 0.45 \left(\frac{m_{\tilde{d}_{jR}}}{100 \text{ GeV}} \right), \quad j = 1, 2, 3, \quad (25)$$

$$\lambda'_{123} \lesssim 0.26 \left(\frac{m_{\tilde{u}_{2L}}}{100 \text{ GeV}} \right), \quad (26)$$

where the first bound is correlated to the down-like squark mass and the second bound to the up-like squark mass. The second bound on λ'_{123} , Eq.(26), is derived using b -quark asymmetry data and is therefore more stringent.

The operator $L_1 Q_2 \bar{D}_1$ also contributes to atomic parity violation, which leads to the slightly stricter bound [33]

$$\lambda'_{121} \lesssim 0.26 \left(\frac{m_{\tilde{u}_{2L}}}{100 \text{ GeV}} \right), \quad (27)$$

depending on the $SU(2)$ doublet up-like squark mass. We see below, that these bounds leave a significant discovery window at HERA.⁹

There has also been an estimate of a collider bound on the operators $L_1 Q_1 \bar{D}_1$ which could be obtained at CDF [35]. This estimated bound is a function of the slepton

⁹There are further relevant bounds on the couplings λ'_{111} from the non-observation of neutrinoless double-beta decay [34], and on $\lambda'_{122}, \lambda'_{133}$, from bounds on neutrino masses [12], which are strongly model dependent. They are the same magnitude as those given and we omit them in our analysis.

mass, not the squark mass and is therefore complimentary to our results. Our bounds only very weakly depend on the selectron mass, and we have chosen it to satisfy the estimated bound given in Ref.[35].

4 Single Squark Production at HERA

Having identified the most promising process by which $\mathcal{R}_p$ might be observed at HERA, we now look more closely at this mechanism.

4.1 Squark Decays

The squarks can decay to the 2-body final states shown in Eqs.(21,22). For the $\mathcal{R}_p$ decays the decay rate is given by

$$\Gamma_1(m_q) = \frac{(\lambda')^2}{16\pi} \left(1 - \frac{m_q^2}{m_{\tilde{q}}^2}\right)^2, \quad (28)$$

where $m_{\tilde{q}}, m_q$ denote the mass of the initial squark and the final state quark, respectively. We have neglected the mass of the electron. For the cascade decay to the photino, $\tilde{q} \rightarrow q + \tilde{\gamma}$, we obtain

$$\Gamma_2(m_q) = \frac{e_q^2 e^2}{8\pi} m_{\tilde{q}} \left(1 - \frac{m_q^2 + M_{\tilde{\gamma}}^2}{m_{\tilde{q}}^2}\right) \mu^{1/2}\left(1, \frac{m_q^2}{m_{\tilde{q}}^2}, \frac{M_{\tilde{\gamma}}^2}{m_{\tilde{q}}^2}\right) \quad (29)$$

where e_q is the charge of the squark in units of the electron charge, $M_{\tilde{\gamma}}$ is the photino mass and the phase space function is given by $\mu(x, y, z) = x^2 + y^2 + z^2 - 2xy - 2xz - 2yz$. In the limit of massless quarks we obtain for the ratio of the cascade decay to the $\mathcal{R}_p$ decay

$$\frac{\Gamma_2}{\Gamma_1} = \frac{2e^2 e_q^2}{(\lambda')^2} \left(1 - \frac{M_{\tilde{\gamma}}^2}{m_{\tilde{q}}^2}\right)^2 \quad (30)$$

$$\gtrsim e_q^2 \left(1 - \frac{M_{\tilde{\gamma}}^2}{m_{\tilde{q}}^2}\right)^2 \left(\frac{100 \text{ GeV}}{m_{\tilde{q}}}\right)^2 \begin{cases} 213, & L_1 Q_1 \bar{D}_j, \\ 2.8, & L_1 Q_2 \bar{D}_{1,3}, \\ 0.95, & L_1 Q_2 \bar{D}_2, \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

where we have used the Eqs.(24-27) to obtain the inequalities. In the case of the operators $L_1 Q_1 \bar{D}_j$ we expect the cascade decay to be dominant by more than an order of magnitude, whereas in the other cases, due to the weakness of the existing bounds, the $\mathcal{R}_p$ decay can be comparable in size or even dominant.

The total decay widths of the squarks are given by

$$\Gamma_{tot}(\tilde{d}_{jR}) = \Gamma_1(m_{ui}) + \Gamma_1(m_{dj}) + \Gamma_2(m_{dj}), \quad (32)$$

$$\Gamma_{tot}(\tilde{u}_{iL}) = \Gamma_1(m_{dj}) + \Gamma_2(m_{ui}). \quad (33)$$

The corresponding widths for the leptoquarks S_1 and $\tilde{R}_2$, respectively, are obtained by setting $\Gamma_2 \equiv 0$.

4.2 Photino Decay

The photino decays as shown in Figure 1. The differential decay rate for the decay to the positron is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\Gamma(\tilde{\gamma} \rightarrow e^+ \bar{u}_{iL} d_{jR})}{dE_e dE_d} = & \frac{\alpha \lambda'^2}{2\pi^2 M_{\tilde{\gamma}} \sqrt{1 - m_d^2/E_d^2}} \left(e_e^2 \frac{(\tilde{\gamma} \cdot \mathbf{e})(\mathbf{d} \cdot \mathbf{u})}{D_e^2} + e_u^2 \frac{(\tilde{\gamma} \cdot \mathbf{u})(\mathbf{e} \cdot \mathbf{d})}{D_u^2} \right. \\ & + e_d^2 \frac{(\tilde{\gamma} \cdot \mathbf{d})(\mathbf{e} \cdot \mathbf{u})}{D_d^2} - e_e e_u \frac{(\tilde{\gamma} \cdot \mathbf{e})(\mathbf{d} \cdot \mathbf{u}) - (\tilde{\gamma} \cdot \mathbf{d})(\mathbf{e} \cdot \mathbf{u}) + (\tilde{\gamma} \cdot \mathbf{u})(\mathbf{e} \cdot \mathbf{d})}{D_e D_u} \\ & + e_d e_e \frac{(\tilde{\gamma} \cdot \mathbf{d})(\mathbf{e} \cdot \mathbf{u}) - (\tilde{\gamma} \cdot \mathbf{u})(\mathbf{e} \cdot \mathbf{d}) + (\tilde{\gamma} \cdot \mathbf{e})(\mathbf{d} \cdot \mathbf{u})}{D_e D_d} \\ & \left. + e_u e_d \frac{(\tilde{\gamma} \cdot \mathbf{d})(\mathbf{e} \cdot \mathbf{u}) - (\tilde{\gamma} \cdot \mathbf{e})(\mathbf{d} \cdot \mathbf{u}) + (\tilde{\gamma} \cdot \mathbf{u})(\mathbf{e} \cdot \mathbf{d})}{D_u D_d} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where α is the electromagnetic coupling, $\tilde{\gamma}$, $\mathbf{e}$ and $\mathbf{d}$ are the 4-momenta of the photino, positron and the d_j -quark, respectively, and $\mathbf{u} = \tilde{\gamma} - \mathbf{e} - \mathbf{d}$ is the momentum of the final state up-like quark. $e_e = -1$, $e_u = \frac{2}{3}$, $e_d = -\frac{1}{3}$ are the charges of the final state particles in units of the absolute value of the electron charge. The propagators squared are given by $D_e = m_{\tilde{\gamma}}^2 - m_{\tilde{e}}^2 - 2\tilde{\gamma} \cdot \mathbf{e}$, $D_d = m_{\tilde{\gamma}}^2 - m_d^2 - 2\tilde{\gamma} \cdot \mathbf{d} + m_d^2$, and $D_u = m_{\tilde{\gamma}}^2 - m_u^2 - 2\tilde{\gamma} \cdot \mathbf{u} + m_u^2$. E_e and E_d are the energy of the positron and the d_j quark, respectively. The dot products are easily expressed in terms of the masses and E_e and E_d

$$\tilde{\gamma} \cdot \mathbf{e} = M_{\tilde{\gamma}} E_e, \quad (35)$$

$$\tilde{\gamma} \cdot \mathbf{d} = M_{\tilde{\gamma}} E_d, \quad (36)$$

$$\tilde{\gamma} \cdot \mathbf{u} = M_{\tilde{\gamma}}^2 - \tilde{\gamma} \cdot (\mathbf{e} + \mathbf{d}), \quad (37)$$

$$\mathbf{e} \cdot \mathbf{d} = \frac{1}{2}(M_{\tilde{\gamma}}^2 + m_u^2 - m_d^2 - 2\tilde{\gamma} \cdot \mathbf{u}), \quad (38)$$

and we have neglected the mass of the electron.

For the other decay modes one obtains analogous formulae. Upon integrating these decay rates numerically we obtain the branching fraction for the decay to the positron

$$BF(\tilde{\gamma} \rightarrow e^+ + 2\text{jets}) = \frac{\Gamma(\tilde{\gamma} \rightarrow e^+ + 2\text{jets})}{\Gamma_{tot}(\tilde{\gamma})} = 0.4378, \quad (39)$$

where we have used $M_{\tilde{\gamma}} = 50 \text{ GeV}$, $m_{\tilde{q}} = 150 \text{ GeV}$. The result only weakly depends on these masses. For $M_{\tilde{\gamma}} = 150 \text{ GeV}$ and $m_{\tilde{q}} = 240 \text{ GeV}$ we obtain 0.4384. This branching fraction was estimated to be $\frac{1}{4}$ in Refs. [8, 9, 10]. If this result (39) is included in Refs. [9, 10] the signals are enhanced by a factor of ~ 3.0 leading to stricter bounds for example in Eq.(17,18) above.

4.3 Inclusive Reaction Cross Section

At tree-level the electron-quark differential cross section for the process (19) is given by

$$\frac{d\hat{\sigma}(e^- u_i \rightarrow d_j \tilde{\gamma})}{d\hat{t} dx} = \frac{\lambda'^2 e^2}{32\pi \hat{s}^2} \left(e_d^2 \frac{\hat{s}(\hat{s} - m_{\tilde{\gamma}}^2 - m_d^2)}{R_d^2} + e_e^2 \frac{(\hat{t} - m_d^2)(\hat{t} - m_{\tilde{\gamma}}^2)}{D_e^2} + 2e_d e_e \frac{\hat{s}\hat{t}}{|R_d D_e|} \right)$$

$$+e_u^2 \frac{(\hat{u} - m_d^2)(\hat{u} - m_{\tilde{\gamma}}^2)}{D_{\tilde{u}}^2} + 2e_d e_u \frac{\hat{s}\hat{u}}{|R_{\tilde{d}} D_{\tilde{u}}|} + 2e_u e_e \frac{\hat{t}(\hat{u} - m_{\tilde{\gamma}}^2 m_d^2)}{|D_{\tilde{u}} D_{\tilde{e}}|} \Big), \quad (40)$$

where $R_{\tilde{d}}^2 = (\hat{s} - m_d^2)^2 + m_d^2 \Gamma_{tot}^2(\tilde{d})$, $D_{\tilde{e}} = \hat{t} - m_{\tilde{e}}^2$, and $D_{\tilde{u}} = \hat{u} - m_{\tilde{u}}^2$. $\hat{s}, \hat{t}$, and $\hat{u}$ are the parton level Mandelstam variables. We have neglected the masses of the incoming particles but have included the masses in the final state. The parton level cross section for the process given in Eq.(20) can be obtained from the above formula through crossing. In order to obtain the electron-proton cross section from the parton level cross section we integrate over the product of (40) and the appropriate i -th generation up-quark structure function $u_i(x, T^2)$,

$$\frac{d\sigma(e^- P \rightarrow d_j + \tilde{\gamma} + X)}{d\hat{t}} = \int \frac{d\hat{\sigma}(e^- u_i \rightarrow d_j \tilde{\gamma})}{d\hat{t} dx} \cdot u_i(x, T^2) dx, \quad (41)$$

where x is the usual Bjorken scaling variable and T^2 is the scale of the transferred momentum squared. For T^2 we have chosen $\hat{s}$, by analogy with photon-gluon fusion (PGF) processes. Using instead for instance Mandelstam t for the scale typically changes the cross section by less than 5%, though for high squark masses the cross section can be enhanced by as much as 15%. In Figure 3 we show the electron-proton cross section before integration over x and Mandelstam t ($= -Q_{DIS}^2$), so as a function of x at fixed $t(= 49200 \text{ GeV}^2)$.

4.4 Event Rates

In the MSSM the renormalization group analysis usually leads to five nearly mass degenerate squarks, with a possibly lighter sixth top squark. These analyses should not be very much affected by a (small) $\mathcal{R}_p$ Yukawa coupling. Since we here do not consider top squark production we set $m_{\tilde{d}_j} = m_{\tilde{u}_i} = M_{SUSY}$. Furthermore, our results are insensitive to the selectron mass and for simplicity and in order to satisfy the estimated constraints of Ref.[35] we set $m_{\tilde{e}} = M_{SUSY}$ as well. The dominant process is the s-channel squark production, so the squark and photino masses will have a significant effect on event rates. Figure 4 shows the event rates for a nominal year's running at HERA (200 pb^{-1}) as a function of M_{SUSY} for various photino masses. The kinematic region considered is;

$$\begin{aligned} 4 \text{ GeV}^2 &< Q_{DIS}^2 < 9.84 \cdot 10^4 \text{ GeV}^2, \\ 10^{-4} &< x < 0.9. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

As determined from Eq.(40) and seen in figure 3, the parton-level cross section strongly peaks at the resonant squark masses and so this is where most of the $\mathcal{R}_p$ events are produced. The kinematic region (42) includes the $\mathcal{R}_p$ squark production peak for practically all accessible squark masses and is chosen to minimise theoretical uncertainties from DIS physics. The change in gradient in figure 4 at M_{SUSY} of around 300 GeV is due to the kinematic region used (42) - at this point the squark resonant peak falls outside the allowed x range.

Figure 5 shows the cross section as a function of λ'_{1ij} and for fixed $\tilde{m}_{\tilde{q}}$, for three popular sets of structure function parameterisations [36, 37, 38].

One of the main aims of the HERA experiments is to determine parton distributions of the proton within the new kinematic regimes available. The present uncertainties in the valence quark distributions lie mainly in the low x ($< 10^{-2}$) and very high x (> 0.4) regions. Using the resonant approximation, $m_q^2 \approx xs$, this corresponds to the wide range of squark masses $30 \rightarrow 200 \text{ GeV}$. Therefore in the case of squark production from valence quarks (λ'_{11j}) we find the uncertainties in the production rate due to the uncertainties in the structure functions to be small, of the order of a few percent. Due to greater uncertainties in the sea quark distributions, uncertainties in the cross section for the λ'_{12j} events can rise to as much as fifty percent, though for most of the parameter space they remain at around ten percent or less. These effects are illustrated in Figure 5. Plots for varying squark mass were also generated and exhibit a similar range of variation for the various parameterisations. In the case of λ'_{11j} , the cross section is heavily dominated by interactions involving the u -valence quarks in the proton, and so as can be seen, the differences between the cross sections for $j = 1, 2, 3$ are very small. The structure function parameterisations were obtained from the PDFLIB package [39]. For all subsequent studies in this paper the KMRS B0 structure function set will be used.

4.5 Event Topology and Differential Cross Sections

It is important to study $\mathcal{R}_p$ event topologies in order to determine the best cuts to separate signal from possible backgrounds at HERA. As discussed in previous sections, for the process we are considering

$$e + q \rightarrow (q')^* \rightarrow q' + \tilde{\gamma}, \quad \tilde{\gamma} \rightarrow e^\pm + 2 \text{ jets} \quad (43)$$

the positron decay channel is seen as the most promising and thus positron transverse momentum (p_{Te}) is an important quantity in our analysis. Also as we expect both the photino and squarks to be relatively massive, thus $\mathcal{R}_p$ events generally have large values of total transverse energy (E_T). Using a Monte-Carlo generator based upon the cross section and branching fraction calculations described above, we now look in more detail at these events.

Figure 6 shows plots of $d\sigma/dp_{Te}$ and $d\sigma/dE_T$ for three different photino masses at $M_{SUSY} = 200 \text{ GeV}$. Figure 7 shows the same quantities for different values of M_{SUSY} where the photino mass is fixed at 50 GeV . Note the log scale used here, made necessary by the strong dependence of the cross section on M_{SUSY} . The Jacobian peak at around M_{SUSY} is evident in the transverse energy plots - particularly for the lower photino masses. Also, at lower photino mass a second peak becomes visible at around $M_{\tilde{\gamma}}$; this is the ‘‘Jacobian peak’’ from the photino decay for those events in which the photino is emitted with low p_T .

It can be seen that p_{Te} and E_T are promising quantities to use in selecting SUSY events, as was previously shown in Ref.[8]. We will also make use of the total energy in the detector (E_{TOTAL}). The corresponding cuts become potentially more powerful at higher SUSY masses, which is also where the cross section falls off and thus efficiency is especially important. In the next section we will study some of the possible backgrounds to these processes, with particular reference to event identification in the ZEUS detector.

5 Detection of R_p in ZEUS

The ZEUS detector is positioned at one of the interaction points of HERA, details of which can be found in Ref.[40]. Here we restrict ourselves to considering the Uranium Calorimeter (UCAL) and the Central Tracking Detector (CTD). These are the two most important components when searching for high p_T positrons, the most promising signature for R_p events.

5.1 Physics Background

We have considered two types of physics background in detail. The first is heavy quark production *via* photon-gluon fusion (see, for example, Ref.[41]). These are generally low- E_T events, but they have relatively high cross sections at HERA and thus their high E_T tail will present a significant background. The most dangerous case can be expected to be b -quark production. The B^0 thus produced can decay semi-leptonically to a positron and a neutrino. The HERWIG generator [42] was used to generate a sample of these events. The cross section for B^0 production by this process was estimated to be 2430 pb with the KMRS B0 set of structure functions. This value can vary by as much as 30% for other choices of structure function parameterisations, due to the large uncertainties in the gluon distribution within the proton.

The second background considered is W^+ production via the process

$$\gamma^* + q \rightarrow W^+ + q', \quad (44)$$

where the virtual photon is radiated from the electron and the W^+ can decay to give a positron. Detailed studies of this process at HERA were presented in [43, 29]. A sample of these event was generated with the generator used in the first of these references. The cross section for this process multiplied by the branching fraction for the ($W^+ \rightarrow e^+ \nu_e$) was estimated to be 78 fb , varying by as much as 40% for different choices of the structure function.

5.2 ‘Fake’ Background

‘Fake’ backgrounds are those caused not by genuine positron production, as in the processes above, but by effects inside the ZEUS detector faking a high p_T positron signal. These include

1. Misidentification of the sign of the curvature (and thus charge) of high p_T electrons in the tracking detector;
2. Overlap of hadrons (particularly π^+) with photons, providing a positive track in the CTD pointing to an electromagnetic cluster in the UCAL.

In order to investigate the first effect, a sample of high Q^2 deep inelastic scattering neutral current events were generated, using the program LEPTO [44]. These events

provide a source of high p_T electrons. The kinematic region over which these events were generated was

$$\begin{aligned} 300 \text{ GeV}^2 < Q^2 < 9.84 \cdot 10^4 \text{ GeV}^2, \\ 10^{-4} < x < 0.9. \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

The cross section within this region is 1350 pb for the KMRS B0 set of structure functions. This value changes by around 10% for the various choices of structure function.

Studying the second of these effects requires a detailed understanding of the ZEUS detector and its environment. Previous studies [8] indicate that these effects can be reduced to a level below that of the other backgrounds mentioned.

5.3 Efficiencies and Resolution

In order to gain some knowledge of the effectiveness of experimental cuts and thus the possible discovery limits for $\tilde{R}_p$ in ZEUS samples of $\tilde{R}_p$ and background were generated corresponding to at least 20 pb^{-1} of HERA luminosity. These events were then passed through a simple simulation of the ZEUS detector, consisting of smearing of particle momenta and energies by nominal detector resolutions, followed by geometrical cuts for detector acceptance. The calorimeter resolutions, taken from Ref.[40], were $\frac{17\%}{\sqrt{E}}$ for the electromagnetic calorimeter, and $\frac{35\%}{\sqrt{E}}$ for hadrons. An angular resolution of 10 mrad , which is quoted in [40] as the worst resolution anywhere within the angular acceptance of the ZEUS calorimeter, was also applied. The CTD resolutions used are summarised in Table 2. Where a charged particle entered the CTD, information about its angle was taken from the CTD. All energies were taken from the calorimeter. CTD momentum information was only used to determine the sign of the charge for positron candidates.

The events were generated at vertices $x = y = 0, z = -20\text{cm} \rightarrow +20\text{cm}$ assuming a uniform distribution, where the origin is defined to be the centre of the ZEUS detector.

The $\tilde{R}_p$ events were generated for various squark masses and couplings at a photino mass of $M_{\tilde{\gamma}} = 50 \text{ GeV}$, for the photino decays to e^- or e^+ and two jets. Although we attempt to identify only events with positrons in the final state, detector resolution will mean that there will be some misidentification of positrons as electrons, and thus some mixing between events exhibiting these two types of decay.

Since the event characteristics change significantly with squark mass, we have developed two sets of cuts, one optimised for the lower range of squark masses (we have considered squark masses down to 100 GeV) and the other for squark masses at the higher limit of observation at HERA.

For the limit of small λ'_{1ij} , which is only accessible at low squark mass, the cuts rely heavily on the details of the positron signal and must be fairly elaborate. The series of cuts found to be optimum in this case, and the corresponding efficiencies for $M_{SUSY} = 100 \text{ GeV}$, $M_{\tilde{\gamma}} = 50 \text{ GeV}$ and $\lambda'_{111} = 0.02$ are shown in Table 3. Figure 8 shows the total energy distribution for background and signal before and after these cuts, for the same parameters. The cuts which were found to be optimum for the limit of high squark mass are summarised in the Table 4. They can be less complex than the

cuts for lower squark masses, due to the large amounts of transverse energy present in $\mathcal{R}_p$ events at high squark masses. Because the E_T cut is very powerful, the cut on the transverse momentum of the positron can be relaxed somewhat. Also shown are the number of events passing each of these cuts, for $M_{SUSY} = 240 \text{ GeV}$, $M_{\tilde{\gamma}} = 50 \text{ GeV}$ and $\lambda'_{111} = 0.07$. Figure 9 shows total energy distributions for background and signal events before and after these cuts, for $M_{SUSY} = 280 \text{ GeV}$, $M_{\tilde{\gamma}} = 50 \text{ GeV}$ and $\lambda'_{111} = 0.084$

6 Results

Figure 10 shows the contour in λ'_{1ij} space corresponding to five events after 200 pb^{-1} luminosity and before any detector acceptance or cuts are applied to the data. Also shown are the existing limits applying for any or all of these couplings, as detailed in sections 4.2 and 5.1. Values to the right of these lines are already ruled out for the couplings λ'_{1ij} as indicated on the plot.

In order to explain our procedure for obtaining the possible discovery reach at ZEUS take as an example the most promising case of λ'_{11j} . The existing limit given in Eq.(24) defines a curve in mass-coupling space. We generated $\mathcal{R}_p$ events at various masses and couplings spaced along this curve. Applying detector smearing, followed by the two sets of cuts from Tables 3 and 4 to these events, we obtain the event numbers and signal/background ratios shown in Figure 11. Where the background is so low that none of the Monte-Carlo background events passed the cuts, the background value corresponding to a one sigma upward fluctuation was used in calculating the ratio. It can be clearly seen that the first set of cuts is most effective at the lower squark masses, whereas the second set is optimised for masses around 240 GeV . The error bars indicate the statistical errors due to the size of the Monte-Carlo samples generated.

Applying the discovery limit criteria:

- Five or more $\mathcal{R}_p$ events surviving our cuts per nominal HERA year (200 pb^{-1}).
- A signal/ $\sqrt{\text{background}}$ ratio of at least three.

to these plots we calculate that $\mathcal{R}_p$ should be observable in the ZEUS detector up to a squark mass of

$$M_{\tilde{q}} \lesssim 270 \text{ GeV}, \quad (46)$$

for $\lambda'_{11j} = 0.081$. For $M_{\tilde{q}} = 100 \text{ GeV}$, $\mathcal{R}_p$ should be observable for

$$\lambda'_{11j} \gtrsim 0.0053 \quad (47)$$

Carrying out a similar procedure for the λ'_{12i} cases we calculate that $\mathcal{R}_p$ should be observable for

$$M_{\tilde{q}} \lesssim 205 \text{ GeV}, \quad \lambda'_{121} = 0.53, \quad (48)$$

$$M_{\tilde{q}} = 100 \text{ GeV}, \quad \lambda'_{121} \gtrsim 0.013, \quad (49)$$

$$M_{\tilde{q}} \lesssim 205 \text{ GeV}, \quad \lambda'_{122} = 0.92, \quad (50)$$

$$M_{\tilde{q}} = 100 GeV, \quad \lambda'_{122} \gtrsim 0.015, \quad (51)$$

$$M_{\tilde{q}} \lesssim 175 GeV, \quad \lambda'_{123} = 0.46, \quad (52)$$

$$M_{\tilde{q}} = 100 GeV, \quad \lambda'_{123} \gtrsim 0.023. \quad (53)$$

It is worth pointing out that it should be possible to extend an analysis by Doncheski and Hewett [46] on the effects of virtual leptoquarks at HERA to $\mathcal{R}_p$ and squarks and thus obtain bounds on much higher mass squarks.

7 Conclusions

We have presented a specific calculation showing a large expected reach at HERA into kinematic regions where R-Parity ($\mathcal{R}_p$) could be discovered.

$\mathcal{R}_p$ could be discovered for λ'_{11j} as low as 5.8×10^{-3} or for squark masses as high as $270 GeV$ at $\lambda'_{11j} = 0.081$ after the first $200 pb^{-1}$ of HERA luminosity. For the other couplings, *i.e.* λ'_{12i} , the reach in squark mass is somewhat lower, but the weaker existing limits on these couplings mean that there is still a substantial window for discovery at HERA. These results will hold for photino mass less than squark mass by a few tens of GeV or more.

These limits compare with a possible exclusion limit for S_0 leptoquarks after $100 pb^{-1}$ of $275 GeV$ at a similar value of coupling λ_L , obtained in Ref.[45]. We conclude that HERA is a very promising experiment for the discovery of supersymmetry with broken R_p and we eagerly await the results of the present run.

Acknowledgements

Thanks are due to Dieter Zeppenfeld, for helpful discussions and use of his computer program for W^+ production at HERA. We thank Neville Harnew for making many valuable suggestions. We also thank Manuel Drees for discussions of the MSSM associated pair production at HERA.

A Table of Dominant $\mathcal{R}_p$ -Signals

Here we explain in detail Table 1 which summarizes the $\mathcal{R}_p$ signals at HERA. The analogous table for hadron coliders has been given in Ref.[19] and we employ the same notation here. We first consider the MSSM pair production mechanisms in the first three horizontal boxes, before we come to the single SUSY production via $\mathcal{R}_p$ in the bottom horizontal box. The signals are determined out of the combination of the SUSY production mechanism and the $\mathcal{R}_p$ decays as indicated in Eqs(6,7). So we in turn discuss the production and decay mechanisms.

At HERA the dominant pair production mechanisms in the MSSM are

$$e^- + q \rightarrow \tilde{e}^- + \tilde{q} \quad (54)$$

$$e^- + q \rightarrow \tilde{\nu}_e + \tilde{q}' \quad (55)$$

as well as

$$e^- + (\gamma^*, Z^{0*}) \rightarrow \tilde{e}^- + \tilde{\Lambda}, \quad (56)$$

where γ^*, Z^{0*} denote the virtual neutral gauge bosons. This latter process has been discussed in [47] for the case of conserved R_p . The cross section is relatively low and we have not made a numerical estimate for the case of R_p decays. However, for completeness we include the dominant signals.

The respective pair produced SUSY particles $\tilde{e}^-\tilde{q}$, $\tilde{\nu}_e\tilde{q}'$, and $\tilde{e}^-\tilde{\Lambda}$, are listed in the first three boxes on the left of the first column. We distinguish the signals according to which class the single dominant operator belongs (*cf.* the assumptions in Section 3).

The dominant decays of the scalar fermions were determined in Ref.[19] and include two different modes. They either decay via a conventional SUSY coupling

$$\tilde{e} \rightarrow e + \tilde{\Lambda} \quad (57)$$

$$\tilde{q} \rightarrow q + \tilde{\Lambda}, \quad (58)$$

or via an R_p -operator

$$\tilde{e} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\tilde{e}) \equiv \begin{cases} (e, \mu, \tau) + \nu, & LL\bar{E} \\ 2 \text{ jets}, & LQ\bar{D} \\ -, & \bar{U}\bar{D}\bar{D} \end{cases} \quad (59)$$

$$\tilde{q} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\tilde{q}) \equiv \begin{cases} -, & LL\bar{E} \\ (e, \nu) + 1 \text{ jet}, & LQ\bar{D} \\ 2 \text{ jets} & \bar{U}\bar{D}\bar{D} \end{cases} \quad (60)$$

We have introduced the notation $\mathcal{O}(\tilde{f})$ to collectively denote the decay products of a scalar fermion via an R_p operator. The blanks indicate cases, where the sfermion does not couple to the operator at tree level. In Ref[19] it was shown that these R_p decays are never dominant for operators $LL\bar{E}$ due to the existing restrictive laboratory bounds [33]. For the operators $L_iQ_j\bar{D}_k$ they can only dominate for higher generational indices. The conditions determining which decays are dominant are discussed in detail in [19]. Clearly the decay products and therefore ultimately the signals depend on the single dominant operator under consideration.

In R_p the LSP also decays within the detector via the diagram shown in Figure 1, provided the constraint 5 is satisfied. The resulting decay products are

$$\tilde{\Lambda} \rightarrow \begin{cases} e_i^\pm e_k^\mp \nu_j, & L_iL_j\bar{E}_k, \\ (e_i^\pm, \nu) + 2 \text{ jets}, & L_iQ_j\bar{D}_k, \\ 3 \text{ jets}, & \bar{U}_i\bar{D}_j\bar{D}_k, \end{cases} \quad (61)$$

where again the decay products depend on the single dominant operator. As discussed in Ref.[22, 19], in special cases involving only the operators $L_iQ_j\bar{D}_j$ (note the last two indices are identical) the LSP can also dominantly decay via the radiative process $\tilde{\Lambda} \rightarrow \gamma + \nu$. This is discussed in more detail in [19].

The dominant and most promising final state signals for a given dominant operator are summarized in the last three columns. In order to determine the complete final state we must collect the decay products of all produced SUSY particles. As an example consider the first line in the first horizontal box. The production mechanism is $e^-q \rightarrow \tilde{e}^-\tilde{q}$. This is followed by the in most cases dominant cascade decay of the scalar fermions:

$$\tilde{e}^-\tilde{q} \rightarrow e^-q + 2\tilde{\Lambda} \quad (62)$$

which is the entry in the first column and first row of the first horizontal box.

For a dominant operator $L_i L_j \bar{E}_k$ the LSP decay is given in Eq.(61). The index k fixes one of the final state *charged* leptons to be either e, μ , or τ . Since the first two indices are anti-symmetric, at least one of them is unequal to 3. Thus of the possible decay products relating to the first two indices: $(e, \mu, \tau) + \nu$, we can choose as the promising case: $(e, \mu) + \nu$. The combined possibilities we write as

$$(ee, e\mu, \mu e, \mu\mu, \tau e, \tau\mu) + \nu \equiv (e, \mu, \tau)^\pm \otimes (e, \mu) + \nu \quad (63)$$

The final state neutrino results in $\cancel{p}_T$ and since we have two LSPs the total signal is

$$e^- q + \cancel{p}_T + 2(e, \mu, \tau)^\pm \otimes (e, \mu)^\mp \quad (64)$$

which is the entry given in the second column and first row of the first horizontal box in the table.

The other entries in the table are determined by considering the other decay modes of the sfermions and the LSP. The second row in the first horizontal box gives the signal for the special radiative decay of the LSP: $\tilde{\Lambda} \rightarrow \gamma + \nu$. The third row is for the case where only the squark decays via a $\tilde{R}_p$ operator and the fourth row of the first horizontal box summarizes the signal where both sfermions decay through an $\tilde{R}_p$ operator.

The signals for the charged current process $e + q \rightarrow \tilde{\nu} + q'$ as well as the electron-photon scattering $e + (\gamma^*, Z^{0*}) \rightarrow \tilde{e} + \tilde{\Lambda}$ are summarised in the second and third horizontal boxes.

One immediate conclusion is that the operators UDD do not lead to any promising signals at HERA. Whereas the operators LLE lead to many charged leptons which should make them easy signals to distinguish.

In the last horizontal box we have summarized the signals for the case of single SUSY production at HERA, which is discussed in detail in this paper. The production mechanism is the resonant s-channel diagram given in Figure 2a. The squark decays are discussed in detail in Section 4.1. The production mechanism is restricted to the operators $LQ\bar{D}$ and the final state signals are summarised in column three at the bottom of the Table.

Note Added: Just before completion we obtained a preprint by J. Hewett [48] which contains related work.

References

- [1] For reviews see H. P. Nilles, Phys. Rep. 110 (1984) 1; G. G. Ross, *Grand Unified Theories*, Benjamin Cummings (1985); H.E.Haber and G.L.Kane, Phys. Rep. 117 (1985) 75.
- [2] E. Gildener, Phys. Rev. D14 (1976) 1667; G. 't Hooft, in "Recent Developments in Gauge Theories", ed. by G. 't Hooft et al, Plenum Press, New York (1981); M. Veltman, Acta Phys. Polon. B12 (1981) 437.

- [3] L.E.Ibanez, G.G.Ross, Phys. Lett. B; CERN-Preprint CERN-TH-6111-91; see also summary in [7].
- [4] B.A. Campbell, S. Davidson, J. Ellis, K. Olive, Phys.Lett. B256(1991)457; W. Fischer, G. Giudice, R.G. Leigh, and S.Paban, Phys. Lett. B 258 (1991)45.
- [5] A. Bouquet and P. Salati, Nucl. Phys. B284 (1987)557; R. Barbieri and A. Masiero, Nucl. Phys. B267 (1986)679; E. Roulet and D. Tommasini, Phys. Lett. B256 (1991) 218; D. Brahm, Ph.D. Thesis, LBL-28841, 1990.
- [6] B.A. Campbell, S. Davidson, J. Ellis, K. Olive, CERN-Preprint CERN-TH-6208-91
- [7] H. Dreiner and G.G. Ross, Oxford Preprint OUTP-92-08P.
- [8] J. Butterworth and H. Dreiner “ R_p -Violation at Hera”, Oxford Preprint, OUNP-1-92, published in the proceedings of the HERA-Workshop, Hamburg, Nov. 1991.
- [9] H. Dreiner and R.J.N. Phillips, Nucl. Phys. B 367 (1991) 591.
- [10] D.P. Roy, CERN preprint, CERN-TH-6339-91.
- [11] H. Dreiner and S. Lola, Oxford Preprint, OUTP-92-02; J.L. Hewett, Argonne Preprint, ANL-HEP-CP-92-23; S. Lola and J. McCurry, Oxford Preprint, OUTP-91-31P; T. Rizzo, Argonne Preprint, ANL-HEP-PR-92-25.
- [12] L.J.Hall and M.Suzuki, Nucl.Phys. B231(1984)419.
- [13] D. Brahm, L. Hall, Phys. Rev. D40 (1989) 2449.
- [14] M.Bento, L.J.Hall and G.G.Ross, Nucl.Phys. B292 (1987)400.
- [15] S.K. Jones and C.H. Llewellyn Smith, Nucl. Phys. B (1983) 145.
- [16] H. Komatsu and R. Rückl, Nucl. Phys. B 299 (1988) 407.
- [17] J. Bartels, Proceedings of the HERA Workshop, Hamburg, Oct. 12-14, 1987.
- [18] S. Weinberg, Phys.Rev. D26 (1982)287 N.Sakai and T.Yanagida, Nucl. Phys. B197(1982)83; S.Dimopoulos, S.Raby and F.Wilczek, Phys.Lett. 112B(1982)133.
- [19] H. Dreiner and G.G. Ross, Nucl. Phys. B 365 (1991) 597.
- [20] J. Ellis, J. Hagelin, D.V. Nanopoulos, K. Olive and M. Sredniki, Nucl. Phys. B 238 (1984) 453.
- [21] L. Ibanez and C. Lopez, Nucl. Phys. B 223 (1984) 511; J. Ellis and F. Zwirner, Nucl. Phys. B 338 (1990) 317.
- [22] S. Dawson, Nucl. Phys. B 261 (1985) 297.
- [23] Y. Eisenberg, U. Karshon, A. Montag and G. D. Wolf, published in the proceedings of the HERA-Workshop, Hamburg, Nov. 1991.

- [24] H. Baer, M. Drees, and X. Tata, Phys. Rev. D 41 (1990) 3414.
- [25] A. Laasanen, Fermilab Preprint FERMILAB-CONF-91-236-E; Presented at particles and Fields '91 Conf., Vancouver, Canada, Aug. 1991
- [26] M. Drees *et al*, Phys. Rev. D 44 (1991) 725.
- [27] J. Ellis and S. Rudaz, Phys. Lett. B 128 (1983) 248.
- [28] T. Kon, T. Kobayashi, Phys. Lett. B266(1991) 382, *ibid* proceedings of the HERA-Workshop.
- [29] U. Baur and D. Zeppenfeld, Nucl. Phys. B325 (1989) 253
- [30] J.L.Hewett, Contrib. to Proc. of 1990 Summer Study on High Energy Phys., Snowmass Colorado.
- [31] W. Buchmüller, R. Rückl and D. Wyler, Phys. Lett. B 191 (1987) 442.
- [32] D. Gingrich and T. Khatri, published in the proceedings of the HERA-Workshop, Hamburg, Nov. 1991.
- [33] V. Barger, G. F. Giudice, and T. Han, Phys. Rev. D40 (1989) 2987.
- [34] R. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev.D34 (1986)3457.
- [35] S. Dimopoulos, R. Esmailzadeh, L.J. Hall, J.-P. Merlo and G.D. Starkman, Phys.Rev. D41 (1990)2099.
- [36] J. Kwiecinski, A.D. Martin, R.G. Roberts and W.J. Stirling, Phys. Rev. D42 (1990) 3645
- [37] J. Morfin and W.K. Tung, Z. Phys. C52 (1991) 13.
- [38] M. Glück, E. Reya and A. Vogt, Z. Phys. C48 (1990) 471 and DO-TH/91-07 (1991).
- [39] H. Plochow-Besch, 'Parton Density Functions', Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Detector and Event Simulation in High Energy Physics, Amsterdam, 8 - 12 April 1991.
- [40] See, for example, The ZEUS Detector Technical Proposal, ZEUS Collaboration, March 1986
The ZEUS Detector Status Report 1989, ZEUS Collaboration.
- [41] See for a discussion of heavy flavour physics at HERA, A. Ali *et al*, contributions published in the proceedings of the HERA-Workshop, Hamburg, Nov. 1991.
- [42] For example, G.Marchesini, B.R.Webber, G.Abbiendi, I.G.Knowles, M.H.Seymour and L.Stanco, preprint Cavendish-HEP-90/26, to be published in Comp. Phys. Comm.

- [43] U. Baur, J. A. M. Vermaseren and D. Zeppenfeld, Nucl. Phys. B375 (1992) No.1
- [44] G. Ingelman, LEPTO 5.2 documentation
- [45] B. Andrieu *et al*, published in the proceedings of the HERA-Workshop, Hamburg, Nov. 1991.
- [46] M.A. Doncheski and J. L. Hewett, Madison, Wisconsin Preprint, MAD-PH-698.
- [47] M. Drees and D. Zeppenfeld, Phys. Rev. D 39 (1989) 2536; Proc. of Snowmass Workshop, Snowmass, CO, June, 1988.
- [48] J. Hewett, Argonne Nat. Lab. Preprint, ANL-HEP-PR-92-83.

<i>Quantity</i>	<i>Polar Angle</i>		
	$90^\circ \rightarrow 45^\circ$	$45^\circ \rightarrow 22^\circ$	$22^\circ \rightarrow 15^\circ$
$1/\text{Momentum}$ (GeV/c) ⁻¹	0.0018 +0.0029/ p	0.0012 +0.0032/ p	0.012 +0.011/ p
θ (<i>radians</i>)	0.0012 +0.0015/ p	0.00061 +0.0015/ p	0.0014 +0.0026/ p
ϕ (<i>radians</i>)	0.00059 +0.0015/ p	0.00053 +0.0023/ p	0.0067 +0.0050/ p

Table 2: Angle and momentum dependence of CTD resolutions used.

Variable used	Cut	Events Remaining			
		$\mathcal{R}_p$	bb	NC DIS	W^+
None	—	1440	5.1×10^5	2.6×10^5	16
$p_{Te}(\text{GeV}/c)$	> 7	537	185	123	12
$E_T(\text{GeV}/c^2)$	> 40	527	139	123	10
$E_{TOTAL}(\text{GeV}/c^2)$	> 40	527	139	113	8
$Missing E_T(\text{GeV}/c^2)$	< 30	508	124	96	2

Table 3: Cuts (1) and Efficiencies, $M_{SUSY} = 100 \text{ GeV}$

Variable used	Cut	Events Remaining			
		$\mathcal{R}_p$	bb	NC DIS	W^+
None	—	152	5.1×10^5	2.6×10^5	16
$p_{Te}(\text{GeV}/c)$	> 2	63	12700	1550	13
$E_T(\text{GeV}/c^2)$	> 120	56	0	26	0.7
$E_{TOTAL}(\text{GeV}/c^2)$	> 450	56	0	0	0.2

Table 4: Cuts (2) and Efficiencies, $M_{SUSY} = 240 \text{ GeV}$

Figure 1: LSP decay

Figure 2: a) Single Squark Production b) Leptoquark-like Decay
c) Cascade Decay

Figure 3: $\mathcal{R}_p$ ep Differential Cross Section

Figure 4: $\mathcal{R}_p$ events rates at HERA

Figure 5: $\mathcal{R}_p$ ep Cross Section for different structure function parameterisations

Figure 6: R_p Differential Cross Sections for various photino masses.

Figure 7: R_p Differential Cross Sections for various squark masses.

Figure 8: Total Energy distributions for events containing positrons
a) Before cuts, and b) after application of cuts in table 3. $M_{SUSY} = 100 \text{ GeV}$, $M_{\tilde{\gamma}} = 50 \text{ GeV}$ and $\lambda'_{111} = 0.02$

Figure 9: Total Energy distributions for events containing positrons
a) Before cuts, and b) after application of cuts in table 4. $M_{SUSY} = 280 \text{ GeV}$, $M_{\tilde{\gamma}} = 50 \text{ GeV}$ and $\lambda'_{111} = 0.084$

Figure 10: R_p Cross Section contours and existing bounds.

Figure 11: Signal/Background at discovery limit